

## KEMBLE'S REPLY

## TO THE STATEMENT OF SECRETARY SCHURZ.

WHAT MR. KEMBLE THINKS OF CIVIL SERVICE REFORM—THE QUESTION OF COMPENSATION FOR CAMPAIGN SERVICES—ACCEPTING MONEY FOR POLITICAL SERVICES—NOT CUSTOMARY AMONG LEADING POLITICIANS.

Special Dispatch to THE REPUBLICAN.

PHILADELPHIA, Aug. 8.

Some time in June last a representative of the Philadelphia Times visited me for the purpose of learning my opinion of the recent civil service order of the President.

I expressed very decidedly my disapproval of it, doubting at the same time the sincerity of those whose duty it was to enforce it, and gave as a reason the fact that Mr. Carl Schurz had himself been a recipient of political bounties during past political campaigns to an extent which bordered upon avarice; that in 1860 he had written a speech he had delivered in Pennsylvania at the rate of \$500 per week, which, I believe, the committee had taken to the extent of three weeks. The point I desired to make against Schurz was that having always regarded him as a mercenary, it would be in bad taste for me to myself up as the executor of political reform.

In the course of a few weeks my remarks, like the story of the three black crows, came back to me in the shape of a denial by Mr. Schurz of not only what I did not say, but covering substantially what I did say. True, the denial of Mr. Schurz is but second hand, and may be totally at variance with what he did say, but as reported it is such an entire departure from the real facts that I feel called upon thus publicly to state just what Mr. Schurz's relations were with the Republicans of Pennsylvania. I herewith append the salient points in Mr. Schurz's denial as they appeared in the Washington Evening Star:

A reporter called on him to interview him in connection with the statement of Gail Hamilton that W. H. Kemble, of Pennsylvania, had paid him \$2,000 for repeating the same speech three times in a campaign in Pennsylvania, and that he put in his pocket thousands of dollars. Schurz replied that the Kemble story was utterly false and ridiculous, as everybody who knows anything about political campaigns would understand at once; that since 1856 he has been active in thirteen campaigns, State and National, from two weeks to four months at a time, an average of six to seven weeks; that in most of these campaigns he took the bulk of the expenses out of his own pocket, sometimes when he could ill afford it, and to the utter neglect of his private affairs; that years ago, at times when he was unable to do this he had, as under the circumstances, accepted of money for compensation for traveling and other incidental expenses or for campaign work; that the aggregate of this compensation, so received from every quarter, fell far short of the actual expense by him incurred; that he thus gave to those campaigns not only his labor and time, amounting to little less than twenty-four solid months, and a not inconsiderable amount of money also; that therefore the Gail Hamilton story about the Kemble payment and the thousands of dollars Mr. Schurz put in his pocket, is grossly false as to facts and conclusions.

This denial, received, simply says that Mr. Schurz never received anything from Pennsylvania politicians beyond his actual expenses, which he claims was customary. Now, whilst I, who am not particularly enamored with civil service reform, am willing to concede that Mr. Schurz had a perfect right to receive from the Republican State committee the full measure of his expenditures, and as a business man an willing to go further and admit that Mr. Schurz had a right to sell his articles for the highest market price, yet his denial is not in accordance with the facts. The State central committee of 1868 engaged Mr. Schurz to speak in Pennsylvania for the sum of \$500 per week, and according to the following letter of Mr. Schurz to the State committee, he must have arrived in Pittsburgh on the 24th of August:

PORT WATKIN, IND., August 15, 1868.

FRIEND GEARY: There is one thing I forgot to say in my last letter. Can you get passes for me on the railroad on which I have to travel according to programme? I can get them for no money so and send them to Pittsburgh, so I can find them on my arrival. You might also notify the Pittsburgh committee that I shall leave St. Louis on the evening of the 23d, and reach Pittsburgh at 4:15 p. m. August 24.

Truly yours, C. SCHURZ.

Just seven days thereafter, including Sunday, Mr. Schurz received five hundred dollars from the Republican State Central Committee for the week's services, as the cash book of the secretary of that committee, Mr. George W. Hamner, shows. It will be seen from this letter that Mr. Schurz, on his arrival at Pittsburgh, had provided for two things: First, that he should have no railroad expenses while in Pennsylvania, and no hotel bills while in Pittsburgh, placing himself in the hands of the committee. I do not know for a certainty, but presume that Mr. Schurz was in the hands of a committee at every place where he spoke in Pennsylvania, hence he could have had no expenses of any magnitude, so that the sum of five hundred dollars which he received from the State Central Committee was in addition to his outlay, and in accordance with a contract previously made. Nor is it true that all Republican speakers received compensation from the State Central Committee. At the same time that Mr. Schurz was stump Pennsylvania at least one hundred gentlemen were doing likewise, and while some of them received compensation sufficient to meet their outlay, many of them received no compensation at all, and no one to the extent of Mr. Schurz, and certainly no aspirant to the position of United States Senator, which Mr. Schurz was at that time, would have been offered money by the State Central Committee unless he had demanded it.

Among others it may not be invincible to mention Hon. Jos. G. Blaine, Hon. Horace Maynard, Hon. Oliver P. Morton, Hon. Henry Wilson, General Joseph R. Hawley, Senator J. W. Patterson, of New Hampshire, Governor Walter Harrison, Hon. Tilton J. Coffey, Hon. James A. Briggs, General Charles H. Van Wyck, Hon. E. D. Culver, Hon. George Boutwell, Hon. G. C. Curtin, Hon. A. K. McClure, Hon. Jas. Pollock, Hon. James H. Campbell. In fact it was not customary for gentlemen who occupied the position in politics that Mr. Schurz and the above gentlemen did to accept compensation for political services. But Mr. Schurz's remark, that at one time, many years back, he did receive compensation to the amount of his expenses, is further contradicted by the fact that in 1860, at the time that the Republican party was not only in its infancy, but had scarcely funds sufficient to meet its needs, the expenses were imperative, the whole campaign for Governor and President having been conducted by the committee with less than \$10,000. Yet Mr. Schurz made a tour in Pennsylvania of about one week, in which all his expenses were paid, and he returned

home, when a slight draft was drawn promptly on our chairman, the Hon. A. K. McClure, for \$500. With an empty treasury there was nothing for us to do but to go down into our own pockets and pay it.

Now be it known, that \$500 in 1860 was a very large sum for any man to realize for political services, but when it comes to be an additional sum to his necessary outlay it became oppressive.

I think I have written sufficient to satisfy the most ardent friend of Mr. Schurz that when I charged him with being one who followed politics as a mercenary and not as a patriot I spoke truly of him.

Very respectfully, WILLIAM H. KEMBLE.

VIRGINIA DEMOCRATS.

MEETING OF THE STATE CONVENTION YESTERDAY—SPEECH OF GOVERNOR KEPLER.

By Telegram to THE REPUBLICAN.

RICHMOND, Va., Aug. 8.

The convention assembled at 2:15 o'clock this afternoon with Col. Lovell in the chair. This gentleman nominated Col. Wm. Lamb as temporary chairman, and the latter thereupon rose and read the report of the committee on the convention, and then proceeded to address the convention. In the course of his speech he alluded to the pledging of the State to the payment of the debt, at the mention of which a great excitement and confusion ensued. The Malone party protesting strongly against discussing the debt question until the convention had adjourned.

The chairman proceeded with great difficulty, and at the conclusion of his address, which lasted upwards of an hour, the excitement became still greater, caused by the attempts of many to get the floor. There was renewed clamor when the chairman announced that the convention was ready for business and decided that Col. Cameron had the floor. The confusion lasted for ten minutes or more, and finally the chairman succeeded in putting the matter to rest by appointing a committee of three from each Congressional district to be appointed on organization, which was carried, and the committee appointed. Quiet now prevailed while waiting announcement from the district delegates. During the excitement Col. Lamb held the chair with wonderful coolness and nerve.

He is the famous defender of Fort Fisher when it was captured toward the end of the late civil war. On this occasion he was a committee report there was a protest and a violent clash between the Malone and Daniel parties. The appointment of committees was now declared to be in order. A committee, consisting of one delegate from each Congressional district, was appointed to wait on the Governor and invite him to a seat on the platform. Governor Kemper accepted the invitation, and made a short speech, in which he alluded to the convention on the victorious career of the Conservative party, which, he said, stands today unopposed by any Radical organization. The Governor concluded by invoking a dignified and successful career in the future, and he retired amidst hearty cheers.

At 4:20 p. m. the reports of the delegations were read by the secretary, naming the committees on credentials and permanent organization. At 5:00 o'clock, the convention adjourned until 6 o'clock to-night.

THE INSURRECTION IN HAYTI.

THE CITY OF PORT AU PRINCE IN A STATE OF SIEGE AND PARTLY DESTROYED—GENERAL.

By Telegram to THE REPUBLICAN.

KINGSTON, JAMAICA, Aug. 2.

The insurrection has broken out again in Hayti. The insurgents are in force about ten miles from Port au Prince. A schooner laden with arms and munitions for the rebels was known to be in the neighborhood, and a Haytian war steamer had been sent to look after her. The city of Port au Prince is declared to be in a state of siege. A large part of the city is in the hands of the rebels, and the city is in a state of confusion. The city is in a state of confusion. The city is in a state of confusion.

Now, in every State an indictment is required as the basis of a requisition to take an alleged criminal from one State into another. The President is a lawyer, and you will have to read up a little in the rudiments of jurisprudence before assuming to speak for those in authority, or they will be compelled to publicly repudiate you.

In December, 1865, the party whom you allege I attempted to spirit away organized at San Antonio, Texas, a gang of men from among the discharged soldiers at that place, ostensibly to join the Liberals in Mexico. On their way to the frontier they were met by the store of Mr. John Boies, at Walde, and robbed it. They were also charged with stopping passengers on the highway and taking horses, arms and money from them.

When these crimes were committed I was in Walde with a company of the 3d Michigan cavalry, and when the information of their crimes reached me I ordered out my command and pursued the marauders, but they evaded me in the dense chaparral that covers that country.

The leader was arrested, however, by a posse under Mr. Wm. Black, collector of customs at Eagle Pass, but subsequently escaped into Mexico.

Indictments were found against "Raymond H. Perry," (the said leader of this gang and others,) at Walde and other places in Texas where they had proceeded.

A copy of the proceedings before the Senate committee that investigated the San Domingo affair fell into the hands of Hon. B. Rush Plimley, of the Texas Legislature, and that gentleman called the attention of the Governor to the fact that the person who figured as commercial agent of the United States at San Domingo was the party against whom these indictments lay.

A requisition upon the authorities of the District of Columbia was issued for the arrest of this party and put in my hands for execution.

This, General, is the basis of what you characterize a conspiracy upon which you now assert the President based his removal. You claim to have relative to the arrest of Perry were never stolen or published, is another illustration of your strict regard for truth. Every line of it was stolen from the files of the secret service division of the Treasury, and appeared in the New York Sun of July 10, 1876.

In your allusion to Mr. Sumner, you give me an opportunity to show that he approved of my action with regard to Perry. I laid the whole matter of his (Perry's) proposed arrest before him, and when I revealed the true character of his informant to him, Mr. Sumner said if he had known that he would have weighed the matter more deliberately before joining issue with the President on some of the points in controversy. I wished to confer with Gov. Claiborne of Mississippi, in which State Perry passed much of his time, on the subject of the latter's arrest, and Mr. Sumner gave me the following letter of introduction, the original of which I happen to still have:

COLLIERIE HICKS, Boston, July 6, 1871.

DEAR SIR: I introduce to you Colonel Moore, of Texas, who desires your confidence, and will interest you by his statements.

Very yours, CHARLES SUMNER.

Secretary, Governor Claiborne, Boston.

"General," you have forced this issue upon me by a series of persecutions that have resulted in depriving me of the means of obtaining bread for my little ones. I admit, if I could have foreseen that you would be able to so impose yourself upon the President as to induce him to summarily dismiss me without a hearing, it might have been better to have

FIRE IN AYLMEY, ONT.

AYLMEY, ONT., August 8.—A fire here this morning in the business portion of the town destroyed seven buildings, including the Commercial Hotel.

## BOYNTON GETS MOORE

## THE CHARGE OF ATTEMPT AT BLACKMAIL MADE UNDER OATH.

MR. MOORE'S INTERESTING REPLY TO SEN. BOYNTON—A LETTER FROM CHARLES SUMNER—AN AFFIDAVIT WHICH FURNISHES FULL AND COMPLETE PARTICULARS OF MR. MOORE'S ALLEGATIONS—GUILTY OR NOT? GUILTY? THAT IS THE QUESTION.

Mr. W. B. Moore has sent us the following for publication:

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 8, 1877.

DR. H. V. BODEN, President House, Eye Brook, N. H.

SIR: My attention has been called to a publication in this morning's paper as follows:

PARAGRAPH HOUSE.

The declaration of ex-Secretary Agent Moore that he attempted to blackmail him does not contain a single element of truth, never sought at any time to communicate with him, either directly or indirectly, for any purpose whatever.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

It is a statement of a man who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him, and who has never been in contact with him.

considered them, accepted your offer to suppress the letters, and have paid you the price of their suppression.

W. B. MOORE.

MR. MOORE'S AFFIDAVIT.

District of Columbia, City of Washington.

William B. Moore, a clerk in the Treasury Department, being first duly sworn, deposes and says that from about March 1 till April 11, 1877, he was supervising special agent of the United States Treasury Department, and from said last mentioned date until the 15th of July instant a special agent of said department.

That on or about the 1st day of said month of March, he was going down Fourteenth street, in said city, toward the Treasury Department, when he was overtaken by one H. V. Boynton, a newspaper correspondent, who accosted him in a familiar manner, substantially as follows: "Well, Moore, they are after you again," when deponent replied: "Yes, it is the old Bristow renewed against me."

Deponent had been informed but a day or two prior to said last mentioned date that Mr. A. J. Sturtevant, a clerk in the Treasury Department, and others, also connected with said Department, had obtained from the files of said Department certain official communications, which, deponent had placed in the hands of President Grant, and that the said Sturtevant and the other parties referred to had been expelled from the Treasury by the present Administration, coupled with such construction as they saw fit to attach to them, so as to get deponent removed from the said office of supervising special agent, and have been expelled from the Treasury.

Deponent had also been informed that the said Sturtevant and the other parties referred to had been expelled from the Treasury by the present Administration, coupled with such construction as they saw fit to attach to them, so as to get deponent removed from the said office of supervising special agent, and have been expelled from the Treasury.

Deponent had also been informed that the said Sturtevant and the other parties referred to had been expelled from the Treasury by the present Administration, coupled with such construction as they saw fit to attach to them, so as to get deponent removed from the said office of supervising special agent, and have been expelled from the Treasury.

Deponent had also been informed that the said Sturtevant and the other parties referred to had been expelled from the Treasury by the present Administration, coupled with such construction as they saw fit to attach to them, so as to get deponent removed from the said office of supervising special agent, and have been expelled from the Treasury.

Deponent had also been informed that the said Sturtevant and the other parties referred to had been expelled from the Treasury by the present Administration, coupled with such construction as they saw fit to attach to them, so as to get deponent removed from the said office of supervising special agent, and have been expelled from the Treasury.

Deponent had also been informed that the said Sturtevant and the other parties referred to had been expelled from the Treasury by the present Administration, coupled with such construction as they saw fit to attach to them, so as to get deponent removed from the said office of supervising special agent, and have been expelled from the Treasury.

Deponent had also been informed that the said Sturtevant and the other parties referred to had been expelled from the Treasury by the present Administration, coupled with such construction as they saw fit to attach to them, so as to get deponent removed from the said office of supervising special agent, and have been expelled from the Treasury.

Deponent had